DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 144 668 JC 770 483

AUTHOR Rutledge, Mark
TITLE The Community Colleges: Opportunities for the Church to Create New Staffing Patterns for Ministry in Higher Education. Perspectives on the Church and the Community College, Paper No. 12.
INSTITUTION United Ministries in Higher Education, Portland, Oreg.
NOTE 29p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Churches; *Church Programs; Church Responsibility; *Church Role; Church Workers; *Clergymen; Community Colleges; *Higher Education; *Junior Colleges; Laymen; *Program Descriptions; Religion; Religious Cultural Groups; Religious Education
IDENTIFIERS *Church School Relationship

ABSTRACT

Changes in the churches and in higher education today are leading to new kinds of roles in campus ministry for laypersons and professional staff. Traditionally, the campus minister has been a direct service provider, with parish clergy and laypersons functioning in secondary back-up roles. These traditional roles are currently being challenged by several changing trends. One is a growing recognition that campus ministry can and perhaps should be a ministry demanding the involvement of the whole church. A second is the emergence of new models as churches search for ways to relate to community colleges, which are different in some critical ways from universities. A third is the knowledge that there are not enough full-time professional campus ministers to go around in this time of stringent finances and changing priorities. This report of a recent conference explores some implications of these changes and trends. It includes descriptions of six experiments in using professional staff as "enablers" rather than providers of ministry at community colleges. It is useful to all those concerned about the church's mission in higher education. (Author/DC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED144668

PERSPECTIVES

on

The Church and the Community College

Paper Number Twelve

THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES: OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE CHURCH TO CREATE NEW STAFFING PATTERNS FOR MINISTRY IN HIGHER EDUCATION

By:
Mark Rutledge

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

William Hallman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND TO ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

The Rev. Mark Rutledge is campus minister at Northern Illinois University and an adjunct staff member of the National U.M.H.E. Community College Program.

JC 770 483

UNITED MINISTRIES IN HIGHER EDUCATION
848 Pittock Block
Portland, Oregon 97205

Traditional Roles Challenged

Changes in the churches and in higher education today are leading to new kinds of roles in campus ministry for laypersons and professional staff. Traditionally, the campus minister has been a direct service provider, "sent" by the church to minister to students at four-year colleges and universities. Parish clergy and laypersons have functioned in secondary back-up roles--on boards and advisory committees, for example. These traditional roles are today being challenged by several changing trends.

One is a growing recognition that campus ministry can and perhaps should be a ministry demanding the involvement of the whole church. A second is the emergence of new models as churches search for ways to relate to community colleges, which are different in some crucial ways from universities. A third is knowledge that there are not enough full-time professional campus ministers to go around in this time of stringent finances and changing priorities. This paper is a report of a conference that took place recently to explore some implications of these changes and trends. It is intended to be helpful to all those who are concerned about the future of the church's mission in higher education.

Campus Minister as an "Enabler"

One assumption the conference focused on is that campus ministry will need professional staff who can <u>enable</u> church folk to do the ministry, rather than staff whose primary role is to provide direct services on campus. For years we have used the rhetoric

of the "enabling" ministry. Now, perhaps, the time is at hand for clarifying the skills and functions necessary for such a ministry.

But what does it mean to talk of "non staff" ministry? What is involved in initiating and maintaining ministry primarily provided by laypersons and volunteers? What are some emerging roles and interactions among clergy, laity, and professional campus ministers? What programs succeed? What does "success" mean? What are some collaborative roles of local church, college, and community? In order to probe these and other questions the Community College Task Force of United Ministries in Higher Education invited six persons currently engaged in ministry to meet for a sharing of experiences. They were selected because they represent various geographical regions, sizes of service areas, urban and rural context, approaches to ministry, and ecumenical interaction. All are experimenting with the use of professional staff as enablers rather than providers of ministry. Their successes and failures, visions and realities, learnings and recommendations follow.

Orange County Campus Ministry

LYNNE FITCH began work in July, 2975 in Orange County, California in a situation where two denominational executives, one Presbyterian and one Methodist, gathered church people together to share a vision of ministry toward nine colleges in the area. Out of that meeting the Orange County Campus Ministry Committee was formed. Its commitment is to help the churches take on responsibility for campus ministry. The committee decided it could not muster sufficient

resources to place professional staff on all of the campuses to develop ministry. Instead, it was agreed to hire one professional staff person to facilitate ministry and develop links between the 130 churches and 9 colleges, 7 of which are community colleges. Funding is ecumenical, that is: Methodist, Baptist, Presbyterian, United Church of Christ, Disciples of Christ, Church of the Brethren, all collaborate. The role of the local church is primary, and as a symbol of this commitment Lynne's office is based not on a campus but in a local church. he describes her position as "rootless," however, because of the amount of time she spends in travel, circuit riding, and establishing connecting links among and between the churches and campuses.

Chicago Metropolitan Task Force

DAVE MC GOWN works for the Chicago Metropolitan Task Force of the Illinois Commission for Campus Christian Ministry. He enables a ministry of local parish people to the 20 community college campuses enrolling more than 200,000 students in the metropolitan area. Dave works with Marilyn Creel in training and supervising seminary students, hired with work-study funds,who are assigned as field representatives to various college districts. Efforts are focused on facilitating teams of clergy and laypersons from parishes, and faculty, staff and students from colleges. These teams address needs within each district. The work is ecumenical in that each ministry team is representative of the religious groups within

the college area. Based on the concept of local mission by local churches, primary ministry providers are parish clergy, although the ministry's theory calls for organizing toward more lay ministry.

Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Chicago

RAY SULLIVAN has administrative responsibility for campus ministry for the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Chicago. He works through the central campus ministry office which operates six "area centered" ministries staffed by ten peer ministers. Their major thrust is to reach out to college age (18-25) young adults of their respective areas no matter what campus they might attend. Off campus their ministry is through local parishes. Peer ministers are the key to this ministry, as Ray speaks of the "de-mystification" of campus ministry and his hopes for a lay ministry which will largely replace the clerical/professional ministry. One of his goals is to seek the involvement of parish priests who hopefully will come to see ministry with community colleges as an extension of their normal parish based ministry.

Southern Appalachian Ministry in Higher Education

JIM SESSIONS works with the Southern Appalachian Ministry in Higher Education, where there are 30 community colleges within a 150-mile radius of Knoxville, Tennessee. Organizing work is focused on three basic constituencies: the local churches and clergy; the faculty, staff, and students at a college; and the local community organizations or associations. However, rather than simply trying to enable "something" to happen among these three constituencies, Jim emphasizes that

his ministry begins with analysis of the community college's role within the socio-economic-cultural context of this South-eastern region. Specifically, Jim's analysis is that dominant external economic interests force mountain young people out into training centers where they will be an unorganized cheap source of labor for industrial development. He sees education as responsive to the needs of this industrial development, with community colleges as part of a governmental/industrial plan to re-locate, assimilate, retrain, and channel young people into predetermined job slots. Given this kind of analysis, ministry is designed to relate to people in ways that are dif-ferent from these dominant historical forces. Ministry sees people not as merely products of society and outside economic forces, but as producers of their own community through their own labor. Beyond simply enabling interaction between church and college, there is this definite "agenda" for the ministry. It is a ministry which sometimes runs counter to the prevailing socio-economic forces, as it attempts to empower people to take charge of their own lives and communities.

Jacksonville Florida Campus Ministry

BOB THOMASON works with the Jackson-ville, Florida, Campus Ministry which in-volves two universities, nine local congre-gations, and four church judicatories. Future plans include expansion to involve other local churches, judicatories, and three other in-stitutions of higher education, one of which is a community college, all in the City of Jacksonville. Bob feels that a unique feature

of this shared ministry lies in the mission development process which led to the creation of goals, objectives, and strategies which are "owned" by all participants. This development work was done carefully before the hiring of any professional campus ministry staff. However, professional staff functions were provided by a judicatory staff person who is a mission developer and who directed the initiating, formative stages of this ministry. Bob sees his role as "chief enabler." He is the only person who is well acquainted with all the cooperating groups. He seeks to bring to the surface the needs and resources of the various constituencies and to identify common concerns. He works to provide structures through which persons and institutions with shared goals can discover each other. He views himself only secondarily as a direct provided of ministry. Members of a central committee, who are designated by each of the participating bodies, are the primary providers of ministry. Funding comes from local congregations (40%), judicatories (36%), and universities in kind (22%).

1st Congregational Church in Kewanee, Illinois

CHUCK WILDMAN is pastor of the 1st Congregational Church in Kewanee, Illinois, and works, with the encouragement of his congregation, in developing ministry with Blackhawk Community College. There are 135 churches within the college's service area, which contains a socio-economic mix of agricultural, industrial, and business interests. The college serves 2,000 full and part-time students, which represents 100% expansion in three years. The ministry has emerged out of

a series of collaborative efforts between the college and the church over the last eight years. The congregation was an early advocate in encouraging the establishment of the college, and continues to play a supportive role, for example, in hiring Chuck partly because he is committed to exploring linkages between the two institutions. But the college plays an initiating role in many of the programs. For example, the college aggressively sought grant funding for a senior citizens center, and once monies were secured turned to the church for space and facilities. The college provides seminars and courses for church school teachers, as well as encouraging Chuck to teach religion and philosophy courses. He feels that teaching is a good way to meet students naturally, which leads, in some cases, to further opportunities for pastoral counseling. The congregation benefits very little in terms of increased student or faculty attendance or church membership, although it may benefit indirectly through community awareness of the church as aware, alert to human needs, and involved in service to people. The congregation does have a vision of ministry which is expressed in service to the community through the college. Chuck says of the church and college, "we need each other" in order to effectively carry out many forms of service.

Nine Issues Identified

Out of this wealth of experience there emerge common themes as well as differences. We can identify nine issues which may serve as lights and signs along to way to builders of relationships between the church and higher education. In this spirit the following observations are offered:

1. HOW TO INITIATE

1. How Can Ministries Using Professional Staff in Enabling Roles Be Initiated?

Based on the experience of these six models the primary locus of initiation can be local church (Kewanee); college (Kewanee); one or more church judicatories (Orange County); an organizational developer who facilitates ministry among a cluster of church and colleges (Jacksonville); a traditional campus minister who takes seriously the task of enabling the whole church (Chicago Metropolitan); a campus ministry administrator who seeks to involve the parish in an extension of its traditional role (Chicago Archdiocese); or the people in a community organization who articulate their needs (Southern Appalachia).

Without vision the people perish. In each case some person or persons have had a vision for ministry and taken responsibility for helping others to see and act on that vision. We think there is good biblical precedent for this.

Without expertise the vision may perish, however, There seems to be general agreement that initiation of ministry does require professional facilitation of some kind. In each of the six ministries the required skill seems to be some level of organizational development, designed to help people define their own goals and strategies in a local situation. For example: Lynne Fitch came into a situation shaped by judicatory staff who called a local coordinating committee into being; Dave McGown seeks to raise up teams of local clergy, lay people, and college personnel who will provide ministry; Bob Thomason was hired to be

a "chief enabler" only after a careful process of mission development in which local church people took charge; Chuck Wildman was called to his situation because leadership in the local church and college had laid the groundwork; Jim Sessions finds indigenous community organizations providing direction for common ministry goals; Ray Sullivan trains peer ministers to create student organizations and work at the long-range objective of re-educating parish priests for young adult ministry. In some cases organizational development results in new structures created to carry ministry forward. In other cases the result is pre-existing structures used in the service of empowering local people and delivering services in new ways.

Recommendation to those seeking to initiate ministry in an enabling style: determine the nature of organizational development needed to provide local ownership of ministry. To be most effective this development must be ecumenical. (One such process is briefly described in Appendix A)

2. HOW TO MAINTAIN MINISTRY

2. Once Initiated, How Can Such Ministry Be Maintained?

One can't maintain or facilitate a ministry that hasn't been developed. But once started, many programs of great promise seem to struggle along or fizzle out. So the task of maintenance is just as important as that of initiation.

The Orange County ministry is dealing with this issue by trying to broaden the base of financial support, recruit others in

church and college to take responsibility for specific program delivery, and develop a variety of activities to increase the project's visability. Given initiation by judicatory inspiration and funds, this experiment may fail unless local congregations increase their commitment. The Chicago Metropolitan ministry is seeking to develop support structures for local ministry teams by mobilizing resources from all levels of the church--local, judicatory, seminary, and state commission. Often these structures seem very fragile in view of the vast scope of this large metropolitan area. The Chicago Archdiocese seems to have the most resources of all six models through access to a well organized network of campus ministry structures. The survival of this ministry does not seem to be in question. The issue seems to be whether or not the familiar style of service delivery by professionals can be modified to encourage a broader base of participation. The Jacksonville ministry now has a relatively strong local support base due to the disciplined and self-conscious development process which preceded the hiring of Bob Thomason. His facilitation work occurs through an organized central committee whose members take on responsibility for specific ministry objectives. The ministry of the 1st Congregational Church of Kewanee to the college seems to be well established, but there are 125 other churches in this college district that do <u>not</u> relate to Blackhawk College. At this time, however, other clergy in this area are beginning to get involved, for example, in the teaching of religion at the college. The Southern Appalachia ministry seeks maintenance support "wherever we can get it," according to

Jim Sessions. This support includes judicatories, allies in the region, foundations, and the commitment of some staff colleagues to simpler life styles.

Factors Enhancing Maintenance

Factors seeming to enhance maintenance: a) thorough development work in initiation stage; b) existing support structures providing a strong base for ongoing facilitation, e.g., committed local congregation, cluster of churches who "own" the ministry, a strong hierarchy, a broad-based network of community support, one or more committed judicatories; c) professional staff who put a priority on working with support constituencies; d) programs meeting real needs of people; e) funding from any and/or all of these.

Factors Hampering Maintenance

Factors seeming to make maintenance difficult: a) weaknesses in any of the factors enhancing maintenance; b) over-dependence on volunteers; c) failure of vision; d) captivity to old images of church and college ministry; e) ministry goals that exceed resources; f) lack of appropriate organization of resources for delivery of services; g) "burn out" among professional or lay leadership.

Recommendation: assess above factors, set realistic goals, build in processes for local people to increase sense of ownership, don't over-extend ministry beyond support base, keep ministry agendas clear and visible, match goals to resources, continually recycle goals, needs assessment, and programs. Good management skills are essential.

3. Concern Growing Out of Issues 1 & 2: Who Is The Ministry's Primary Constituency?

3. WHO IS MINISTRY'S PRIMARY CONSTITUENCY?

This concern is a matter of loyalty. When the chips are down a ministry may have to decide whether to identify with the church, or with a community or college it intends to serve.

For example, if one's primary constituency is the church and its agencies that support the ministry financially (Jacksonville, Chicago Metropolitan) then one would "enable" those groups to implement their agendas. This involves a considerable degree of trust in a style of "participatory democracy" and in the capabilities of church people to produce a ministry that has theological integrity. (This same may be said of ministry produced by professionals).

On the other hand, if one's primary constituency is local community organizations (Southern Appalachia), then one would enable those groups to express their agendas. These agendas may grow out of an analysis of social conditions and a certain understanding of mission which leads to the commitment to help people create their own community life. In such a case one would be less likely to trust the local churches to set the agenda, since they may be perceived as made up of groups (plant managers, middle class shop owners, industrial leaders) whose goals for the community are at variance with those of the ministry's primary constituency--the people who need empowerment.

The ministry has a double problem when its funds come from one constituency and its

loyalty is to the second. Whom do you wish to "enable"?

Should Church Be Primary Constituency?

Should the church be a primary constituency? Pro: a) if campus ministry has a future it is probably with the church; b) the church can be helped to mature in its understanding of its mission; c) we are the product of the church and our loyalty commits us to helping the church grow; d) some good things are happening as a result of increasing involvement of local churches with community colleges; e) the church's self-understanding (theology) commits it to community service. Con: a) not everything the church does can be legitimized as ministry according to a theology of community service; b) people in our "main-line" denomination are often separated from community college clientele by barriers of race, class, and culture; c) the church often has an elitist view of campus ministry, e.g., it may be unaware of the authentic mission of the community college; d) some ministry simply won't happen if it is left to traditional church channels to implement.

Pro:

Con:

Recommendation: make a decision--with whom will you live, fight, and die? Once you have decided, try to build bridges among all relevant constitutencies.

4. What Is the Role Of Staff In a Non Staff" Ministry?

4. ROLE OF STAFF

Emerging staff roles, according to the six ministries, point to a future where professional staff will:

a) Facilitate a process wherein local

people (whether from churches or community-based constituencies) organize themselves to take responsibility for implementing the ministry;

b) function as "circuit-riders" in some larger-than-local area in order to initiate, encourage, consult with, and nurture local teams of clergy and laypersons who are implementing ministry;

c) work as "linkage persons" who know persons and institutional patterns within churches, colleges, and communities, and who can bring them together around common concerns;

d) train peer ministers, seminary interns, and lay volunteers in specific skills for ministry;

e) be local pastors who have a vision of how the local church and the college can be partners in mission;

f) be local campus ministers who extend ministry beyond the bounds of traditional four year institutions, and who understand that higher education today occurs within a "learning society";

g) give high priority to their role of enabler/facilitator, alongside of their role of provider of ministry;

h) be ecumenical in vision and implementation;

i) be willing to explore alternative sources of funding;

j) be knowledgeable about judicatory problems and potentials;

k) be managers rather than lone rangers; team builders rather than empire builders:

i) understand how to create structures what will encourage responses of love and justice among persons; understand how systems and persons interact.

Comment: if the development of ministry is understood to occur along a continuum with initiation at one stage and maintenance at another, then staff roles will vary according to stage. Facilitation skills are common to both stages, but the emphases will vary.

Like any continuum there are subtle gradations as well as clear transitions between stages. Problems can occur when those responsible for determining ministry goals are unclear as to what stage they are in. For example, Lynne Fitch expressed some concerns that she may be expected to be a mission initiator and maintainer at the same time. Not only is it difficult to perform both roles simultaneously, but questions can be raised as to whether or not separate persons may be necessary for each stage.

Recommendations: be self-aware as to where you are along this continuum and then be intentional in utilizing staff functions appropriately. Ministry needs define staff roles, not the reverse.

5. WHAT PROGRAMS ARE SUCCESSFUL?

5. What Programs Work and Are Successful?

This is related to a ministry's self-analysis relative to the first four issues and to the following issue.

6. WHAT ARE GOALS FOR MINISTRY?

6. What Are the Goals for Ministry?

The purpose of the church is to increase among persons love of God and neighbor. Specific ministry goals should reflect this fundamental self-understanding.

At many points there seems to be com-

patibility between this basic mission of the church and the education and service missions of community colleges. For example, all six ministries with the colleges agree on the following similar goals:

1) helping individuals develop their full human potential.

2) discovering truth.

3) making our communities a better place to live.

These Have "Worked"

If the relative success (what works) of programs is evaluated on the basis of these general goals, then the following projects sponsored by the various ministries may be illustrative:

a) the Kewanee ministry with Blackhawk College cites college/church cooperation in funding and operating a senior citizen's center, the teaching of philosophy and ethics at the college, and the college providing resources to the churches through the training of church school teachers.

b) the Orange County Campus Ministry cites the starting of a young adult ministry, the publishing of a newsletter, development of a reciprocal church/college Speakers Bureau, cooperative programming with an area women's center, joint planning for courses, and general network-building activities.

c) the Chicago Roman Catholic Archdiocese finds the most success in terms of the numbers of students in social programming. It is from these contacts that students are encouraged to become involved in educational, liturgical, prayer group, discussion seminars, and social service experiences. Essential to the development of these on-campus programs is the cooperation of the college administrations.

d) the Southern Appalachia ministry has learned that programs work when they are responsive to real human needs, and when people work hard enough on them. Many programs, then, are based in indigenous community groups, for example, miners, textile workers, small farmers, and community-based child care groups. Examples: "Save Our Cumberland Mountains"; "East Tennessee Energy Group"; labor union locals, etc.

e) The Jacksonville ministry has discovered that programs which can be carried out through already existing groups and channels have the most success, e.g., the "word" communicated through campus newspapers; personal services through orientation programs, counseling centers, and placement offices; lectures in already existing classes and special interdisciplinary courses; service through well established service organizations; enrichment of local church programs utilizing university personnel.

f) the Chicago Metropolitan ministry points to programming being carried out by local ministry teams. Some examples are adjunct counseling at the College of Lake County; continuing education courses at Morton and Oakton colleges; religious studies development at the College of DuPage.

Some Goal Differences Depend On:

Goal Development

A. Constituency

A) Constituency. Goals can reflect an intention to develop programs in which church resources assist the college, college resources augment the church, or their mutual resources cooperatively address community needs both have a responsibility to serve. It makes a difference in goals if the ministry is trying to help empower one community constituency which, in order to maintain its integrity,

must oppose the churches which financially support the ministry. What is one ministry's meat may be another's poison.

B) Stage if Development. In initial stages of development, goals are likely to be set in terms of activities which build a sense of involvement and ownership on the part of local people. In maintenance stages goals are more likely to reflect prior analysis and to point to specific areas of human need which may be addressed programatically. Initially it may be necessary to show church people that community colleges really do have resources which may assist the church in performing its mission more effectively. It may be equally important to persuade the college that the church has the capabilities and the willingness to assist it in the performance of its educational and community service missions. Once this awareness has been developed, and commitment to do something has been made, some organizational arrangements need to be formalized to ensure ongoing program planning, implementation, and evaluation.

B. Stages of Development

A Word About Success: If one is in the initiating stages of development, then goals are directed to helping various constituencies within the churches to plan and move toward provision of ministry. Thus specific programming within either church, college, or community may be minimal at this stage. "Success" would therefore be measured by the degree to which church people began to organize and to perceive themselves as the ones primarily responsible for developing program and strategy.

C. Measuring Success

If one is in the maintenance stage, then goals will be built on the slower preparation which went before, and program development will be in the hands of local clergy and laypersons. Some structures for program implementation will have been formed during the initiation stage. One test of whether maintenance activities "succeed" is whether these structures are capable of producing programs compatible with locally determined goals.

Recommendations: determine your goals intentionally based on your understanding of the mission of the church. Decide who your constituencies are and where you are in stage of development. Assess your resources and the needs of people in the churches, colleges, and the community. Plan, implement, and evaluate specific programs based on these goals and analyses.

7. ROLE OF LOCAL CHURCH

7. What is the Role of the Local Church in Higher Education Ministries?

Some suggested roles are: receiver of services from the college, e.g., courses for training church school teachers (Kewanee); provider of services to the college, e.g., making space available for satellite college programs (Kewanee); primary source of human resources (Chicago Metropolitan); provider of ministry support facilities (Orange County); primary program planning, implementation, and evaluation (Jacksonville); sometimes adversary, sometimes ally (Southern Appalachia); parish support services to young adults, and liturgical center (Chicago Archdiocese).

These illustrations from the six ministries indicate that the entire local church itself

can have a role to play in higher education ministry. This is a different role from that in which the church simply employs staff to be direct service providers, which sometimes leads to the total identification of the campus ministry with the campus minister. The case studies suggest that the local church has an authentic role to play in relationship to higher education--a role broader and more direct than simply the hiring of staff.

Recommendation: that local churches take responsibility for designing its own ministry with higher education, in collaboration with colleges, community groups, professional staff, and judicatory expressions of the church. This implies that more parish clergy may see themselves also as college town pastors who enable their congregations to become more directly involved with higher education.

8. What is the Role of the Colleges in This Ministry?

8. ROLE OF COLLEGES

Some suggested roles are: initiator of relationships with local churches (Kewanee, Chicago Metropolitan Ministry); collaborator in mission (Kewanee, Orange County, Jacksonville); receiver of church's ministry (Chicago Archdiocese, Metropolitan, Kewanee); mutual resourcer (Orange Country); sometimes ally, sometimes adversary (Southern Appalachia).

This partial listing is sufficient to indicate that the community college can be a challenger to the churches to take ministry to the community more seriously. It also illustrates the variety of relationships which colleges can have with churches, based on

actual programs currently in existence.

Recommendation: that the community colleges be considered a rich resource for the church as it engages in mission. Some ministry staff functions can be provided by college faculty and staff, a surprising number of whom have had professional theological education and training.

9. EFFECTIVE ORGANIZATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS?

9. What Organizational Arrangements Produce Effective Delivery of Ministry?

Some suggested arrangements are: Coordinating Committee (Orange Country); local church liaison (Kewanee); network of ministry teams and seminary field representatives (Chicago Metropolitan); Central Committee (Jacksorville); campus ministry administrative structures and local parishes (Chicago Archdiocese); network of community organizations, churches perceived as allies, and colleges willing to cooperate (Southern Appalachia).

In no case here is the primary responsibility for delivering services that of professional staff. Staff may have secondary functions as providers of ministry. As enablers, staff have widely varying roles relative to the organizations and persons who do provide ministry, and these roles have been described above in issue number 4.

The design of the organization charged with delivery of ministry varies in each of the models. Because the Jacksonville ministry is well along in the maintenance stage, and seems to be successful in involving volunteers in direct ministry tasks, its Central Committee structure may contain useful learnings that

are transferrable to other situations. A brief description follows.

The Jacksonville Central Committee is made up of members from the local church and university constituencies which support the ministry. Its plan of organization is to sub-divide into five subcommittees, each with its own area of responsibility; These are program development at (1) Jacksonville University; (2) University of North Florida; (3) local churches; (4) the general community; and (5) research and development. Each subcommittee is responsible for implementation of locally determined objectives. Each chooses a chairperson and secretary to fulfill its coordinating and recording functions. Each decides what task groups it needs to carry out its objectives, and enlists additional persons for membership at needed. Each reports its progress, needs, successes, and failures to the Central Committee. The staff have a consulting, resourcing, and enabling role with all subcommittees and task groups.

Recommendations: one goal of the initiation stage should be the formation of some organizational plan for carrying out ministry. This organizational form can have considerable variation depending on size of service area, relationships to support constituencies, and the roles of local church, volunteers and staff. The organizational structure adopted should result in continuous program planning, implementation, evaluation, and recycling.

Conclusions:

Concluding Observations:

1. The community college movement is challenging many of our stereotypes of who "students" are and what higher education is. As we become more of a learning society it becomes clearer that ministry in higher education must become a dimension of the life of the church at every level.

2. There will continue to be a need for professional staff to work at the interface between higher education and the church. Some professional leadership is essential if ministry is to be developed and maintained. However, there is great flexibility about who can carry leadership, and how it may be applied in different situations.

3. Organizational development and management skills will be increasingly important for staff at all levels of the church. Specific role expectations for staff in a ministry should be clearly defined.

4. There is a need for intentionality about the development of local ownership of ministry, as well as sensitivity to process. The church needs enablers who can get ministry started and then get out, as well as enablers who facilitate an on-going ministry.

5. Ministry goals, based on analysis of social context, local needs, and understanding of the church's mission, should be clearly established and continuously evaluated.

6. There is broad agreement that the church's mission is to continue what "Jesus began to do and teach" (Acts 1:1). This means that our purpose is to declare the good news, to be an agent of healing and reconciliation, and to work for liberty and justice.

7. At the same time there will continue to be points of tension as church people debate specific goals, priorities, concepts or mission, and the appropriateness of various strategies.

8. There is a need, now more than ever, for commitment to ecumenical co-operation as a condition of effective ministry in higher education.

9. These case studies have implications for the church's ministry in higher education far beyond work with community colleges. Some ministries are already successfully practicing the concepts described here with four-year colleges and universities, as well as area-wide systems of higher education. These learnings are significant for all our ministries.

10. There is no one model that will "work" for all situations. Nevertheless, it is possible to identify components that are involved in effective mission in many places. It is predicted that some of those elements, which have been identified in this paper, will become increasingly important for the future mission of the church in higher education.

APPENDIX A

A PROCESS OF MISSION DEVELOPMENT *

The Jacksonville, Florida, Campus Ministry grew out of a mission development process designed by the Rev. Edwin Albright, Jr., who is a staff member of the Presbytery of Suwannee. At the invitation of the Community College Task Force of United Ministries in Higher Education he is writing an article describing that process to be published later this year. A summary of the major steps involved in the process is outlined as follows:

1. Authorization of a Clear Task. The persons and groups which have the power to implement ministry are involved at the very beginning. Those who have the power to make decisions are the ones to authorize a process of mission development and to set it in motion. At the start it is important to legitimize the process by including personnel and a defined methodology for accomplishment.

2. Data Gathering. Identify the target persons and groups from whom information and input is needed. Design a process, including data-gathering instruments, for getting all relevant information. As many persons as possible who have a stake in the mission and who will be the ones to carry it out should be involved.

3. Summarization and Recycling. Once the raw data and information have been gathered, the group responsible for monitoring and carrying out the process summarizes the input from all persons and groups. This summary is submitted back to those who provided the data, with a request that it be reviewed for accuracy and completeness. Those providing data are requested to make revisions, additions, etc., so that their views will be faithfully incorporated throughout the process.

4. Proposing of Goals and Objectives and Recycling. Based on the data which has been gathered and reviewed an initial proposal is drawn up reflecting all the information submitted. This proposal contains goals and objectives for mission. All those who have been involved are asked to review the proposed goals and objectives and again make revisions as necessary.

5. Adopting Goals and Objectives. Those who have the power to decide and to implement mission formally adopt the agreed upon goals and objectives according to their decision-making policy.

6. Prioritizing of Goals and Objectives. At the time they adopt them, they are also asked to prioritize them.

7. Adopting New Organizational Arrangements. Whatever organizational structure is considered to be the most effective for implementing the prioritized goals and objectives is adopted.

8. Implementation of Goals and Objectives. The goals and objectives are carried out through the organizational arrangements that are adopted.

9 Review and Evaluation and Resetting of Goals and Objectives.

This is a continuous process that occurs once the goals and objectives have been implemented. This allows for continuous monitoring and feedback on the effectiveness of the total mission.

* For complete description of this development see "Perspective Paper No. 11,"A PLAN FOR ACTION", by Edwin W. Albright, Jr.

APPENDIX B

The persons representing the six ministries participating in the conference are listed below for reference. The reader is invited to contact them for additional information.

The Rev. Lynn Fitch
Orange County Campus Ministry
161 S. Orange
Orange CA 92666
(Phone: 714/639-5462)

The Rev. David McGown
Chicago Metropolitan Task Force
United Commission on Campus
Christian Ministries
Agape House
1046 West Polk
Chicago IL 60607
(Phone: 312/666-2676)

Fr. Ray Sullivan
Director of Campus Ministry Dept.
Archdiocese of Chicago
826 S. Morgan Street
Chicago IL 60607
(Phone: 312/226-1880)

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

NOV 18 1977

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES

The Rev. Jim Sessions
Southern Appalachia Ministry in
Higher Education
1538 Highland
Knoxville TN 37916
(Phone: 615/546-7811)

The Rev. Robert Thomason
Jacksonville Campus Ministry
Box 191
Jacksonville FL 32211
(Phone: 904/744-3466)

The Rev. Charles Wildman
First Congregational Church
224 West Prospect Street
Kewanee IL 61433
(Phone: 309/852-2779)

**

The Rev. Robert A. Mayo
UMHE Community College Program
287 Park Avenue South
New York NY 10010
(Phone: 212/475-2121)

The Rev. Mark Rutledge
Northern Illinois University
633 West Locust
DeKalb IL 60115
(Phone: 815/758-8176)